DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 776 FL 021 229

AUTHOR Loheyde, Kristin I.
TITLE Foreign Language Teaching at the University of Pennsylvania: A Language Planning Case Study.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 23p.; For the complete journal, see FL 021 224.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v9 n1 p105-126 Spr 1993

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Education); Case Studies; College Outcomes Assessment; *College Second Language Programs; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; *International Studies; *Language Planning; Language Proficiency; Program Development; Program Implementation; School Policy; Study Abroad; *Uncommonly Taught Languages; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS Content Area Teaching; *University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The development and implementation of undergraduate second language programs at the University of Pennsylvania are analyzed in terms of several models of language planning. First, the stated foreign language proficiency goals of the four undergraduate colleges (arts and sciences, nursing, economics, and engineering and applied science), the Penn Language Center, the Office of International Programs, and the various foreign language departments are outlined. Strategies used for implementing those goals are then enumerated, including proficiency testing, the less commonly taught languages and content-based instruction used at the Penn Language Center, other study abroad programs sponsored by the Office of International Programs and campus-wide resources and projects to promote language use. Outcomes in the various programs are examined, and it is concluded that, despite the apparent dedication and achieved outcomes of these efforts, there is evidence of some hesitancy to commit fully to language instruction, including reluctance to require language skills before matriculation and limited articulation or interaction between language centers and related programs. In the context of a language planning framework such as that of J. Fishman (1979) problems or areas for improvement are identified in the phases of issue clarification, codification of purposes and procedures, elaboration of priorities and deadlines, implementation, evaluation, and iteration/cultivation. Contains 34 references.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cheryl Donnelly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED359276

Foreign language teaching at the University of Pennsylvania: A language planning case study

Kristin I. Loheyde
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

Is the University of Pennsylvania an example of successful foreign language planning? This paper addresses this question using J. Fishman's language planning framework to analyze various foreign language opportunities at the University. The Romance Language Department, the Penn Language Center, the Office of International Programs and other foreign language opportunities at the University are described and analyzed. This analysis reveals the strengths and weaknesses of the University's attempts to "internationalize." Further suggestions to reach this goal are given.

Introduction

Many countries worldwide view multilingualism as an opportunity to increase one's knowledge, to better one's understanding of international and national diversity, and to expand economic, social, and political spheres. These countries treat bilingualism as a "national resource to be cherished, nourished and sustained" (Tucker, 1986:361). Multilingualism is characteristic of these countries and has become a way of life. It is therefore ironic that the highly-diversified, multicultural United States persists on treating multilingualism as a deficiency as opposed to other countries where monolingualism is a sign of a lack of education (Blanco, 1978:499).

The United States needs to create a new image of multilingualism and multiculturalism and to identify the means to promote languages as resources. Institutions of higher education should increase the emphasis of foreign language instruction to produce a new generation of proficient speakers of second languages. Foreign language is a resource that these institutions should capitalize on to help

FL021229

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

change American attitudes and to keep the United States competitive with other developed countries. This would not only enrich the lives of our citizens but would place the United States equal to other countries that encourage multilingualism as a national resource.

In his discussion of orientations towards language, Ruiz suggests that there are three orientations towards language planning:

1. Language-as-problem: Linguistic minorities must overcome the language obstacle in order to mainstream into the majority culture. This is the most prevalent attitude in American society today.

2. Language-as-right: Linguistic minorities have human and civil rights to maintain their mother-tongue.

3. Language-as-resource: The nation as a whole would benefit from the conservation and development of its linguistic resources (1984).

Ruiz proposes the third orientation, language-as-resource, as "vital to the interest of language planning in the United States" (15). It is with this in mind I would like to suggest that it is high time American institutions of higher education take on the responsibility of extensive foreign language instruction and requirements.

The purpose of the present study is to examine the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and its international programs as an example of foreign language use at the undergraduate level. Research questions addressed are:

1) Can Penn's network of international programs be considered an example of language planning?

2) If so, is it effective language planning?

3) What could and what should Penn be doing to increase effectiveness of its planning with a language-as-resource orientation?

Background information about language planning will be given first. Then, a case study of foreign language use at Penn will be presented. Finally, Fishman's theoretical framework of language planning will be used to evaluate this case study.

Review of Relevant Research

Language Planning Definitions

Language planning is the "exercise of judgement in the form of choices among available forms" and the "evaluation of linguistic change" according to Haugen (1966:52), one of the first to consider language planning systematically. This preliminary definition focuses on what is now identified as the corpus, or language structure, portion of language planning. Planning types have been expanded to include the status, or use, of language. Linguists have been attempting to specify a precise model to lead to a constructive theory of language planning. A sampling of language planning definitions in the last twenty years includes:

> "the management of linguistic innovation" (Karam, 1974:118);
>
> identifying a problem and trying to find the "best (or optimal, most efficient, most valuable) alternative to solve a problem" (Rubin, 1977:282);
>
> applying to a "wide range of processes involving planned change in the structure and status of language varieties" (Tollefson, 1981:175);
>
> the "field of study to which matters of language policy relate" and can change language function and structure (Corson, 1990:13).

Fishman defines language planning as the "authoritative allocation of resources to language" (1979:11). This definition does not focus on language planning to solve problems. It is most appropriate to the Penn case study because it involves the "assignment of funds, manpower, sanctions and concern to language use and/or language structure" (11) as is true with foreign language instruction.

Language Planning Frameworks

Several frameworks have been suggested for the process of language planning. Haugen was one of the first to isolate the relevant issues of language planning. He suggests that the processes involve selection, codification, acceptance, and elaboration (1972:97). The framework Karam (1974) proposes involves planning (data collection, feasibility, decision-making), plan writing, implementation (identification, codification, dissemination), and evaluation (monitoring, assessing). Rubin's four language planning steps are: fact-finding; establishing goals, strategies, and outcomes; implementation; and, feedback (1977:284).

Although any of these models are suitable, Fishman's framework is the most relevant to the case study of Penn's international programs because of his stress on the cyclical nature of language planning (LP) and the tendency away from LP as a problem. He also proposes a series of stages (cycles) necessary for successful language planning: decision-making, codification, elaboration, implementation, evaluation and iteration or cultivation (1979). Although Fishman focuses on status and corpus planning, his framework can be implemented to judge whether Penn, as a representative of institutions of higher education, can be defined as an example of language planning at the acquisition cultivation level (Hornberger, 1992). Hornberger's integrative model for types and approaches to language planning clearly demonstrates this (Table 1).

Table 1:
Integrative Model for Types and Approaches to Language Planning

APPROACHES	POLICY PLANNING (on form)	CULTIVATION PLANNING (on function)
Types	Goals	Goals
STATUS PLANNING (about uses)	Officialization Nationalization Standardization status Proscription	Revival Maintenance Spread Interlingual Communication
ACQUISITION PLANNING (about users)	Education/School Literary Religious Mass Media Work	Reacquisition Maintenance Shift Foreign/Second Language Literacy
CORPUS PLANNING (about language)	Standardization corpus auxiliary code Graphization	Modernization lexical stylistic Renovation purification Reform, etc.

(Hornberger, 1992)

As shown above, foreign language focuses on the users of language (here, undergraduate students) and how they access foreign languages.

Foreign Language in Higher Education

Language maintenance is rarely recognized in the United States as compatible with the public interest; rather, it is often seen to be a burden which hinders "progress, modernity, and efficiency" (Fishman, 1982:522). However, in this modern society, mass communication, efficient means of travel, and international interdependence have created a smaller global environment by shortening the distance between countries. Knowledge of a second language is beneficial to understanding the effects of global interaction. It is also beneficial to one's personal growth: trying to understand another language and culture leads to a better understanding of one's own language and culture. As Fishman points out, elites for hundreds of years have known that multilingualism provides "greater opportunities, greater insight, deeper appreciation, greater sensitivity..." for the speaker (1981:525).

Since the passage of the National Educational Act in 1958, there has been increasing awareness of the importance of foreign language proficiency. However, as Arendt points out, foreign language learning is not part of the American environment, nor of its tradition, as it is in Europe (1973:198). This leads to difficulty in developing a positive attitude toward valuing second language proficiency. Since Americans do not regard foreign languages as important, the significance of long-range planning of cultural diversity and skills is pushed aside (Fixman, 1989:2). This is demonstrated by the relatively small number of Americans who study and/or are considered to be proficient in a second language (Lambert, 1990:7).

Rubin suggests that foreign language requirements at universities do not constitute planning, but are merely examples of setting policy (1977:286). The students' needs for a foreign language are not identified nor are the skills necessary for language addressed. Lambert agrees with this and suggests a national strategy towards a use-oriented typology of foreign language instruction instead of the predominant cultural-awareness orientation (1989:6).

University of Pennsylvania Case Study

Given the prevailing attitudes and practices in the United States, what in fact is going on in institutions of higher education? In this section, the processes affecting foreign language learning at the undergraduate level at Penn are analyzed.

Penn has a stated goal of accomplishing greater internationalization. My purpose is to examine what is presently being done at Penn to accomplish its stated goal and to determine Penn's philosophy regarding foreign languages. I will not survey all foreign language opportunities at Penn. Instead, I will discuss selected programs associated with foreign languages which are crucial to understanding Penn's activities. My focus is on foreign language requirements for undergraduates, the Penn Language Center, the study abroad program, and the Romance Language Department.

Goals

In the most recent Annual Report, 1990-1991, the internationalization of Penn was identified as one of the university's academic goals (University of Pennsylvania, 1991:17). However, foreign language proficiency is not necessary for admission and the career center does not focus on foreign language proficiency for employment. The Provost, although having strong personal goals of second language proficiency, does not see a unified philosophy towards foreign languages at Penn. As he expressed, the individual centers and departments have explicit goals which cannot reflect a single "University of Pennsylvania Philosophy."

Colleges

Each of the four undergraduate colleges are independently responsible for designating graduation requirements. Goals with respect to foreign language learning vary within the four schools. The School of Arts and Sciences (SAS) aims for a pre-determined proficiency level for all its graduates. The School of Nursing and the Wharton School have set a competency-based requirement for their graduates. As of yet, the School of Engineering and Applied Science does not have a foreign language competency requirement for graduation, although individual departments within the school do.

Penn Language Center

The Penn Language Center (PLC) was established in the fall of 1989 with the objective to offer less-commonly taught foreign languages as well as content-based classes in the more commonly taught languages. In a constantly changing world, the PLC sees itself as being responsible for supporting understanding of other cultures. Its primary goal is to better language opportunities at Penn without exhausting the University's funds.

Office of International Programs

The Office of International Programs (OIP) coordinates the various international programs on campus and organizes the study-abroad programs. One of the staff members suggested that the overall goal of OIP is to "get people hooked on language" whether overseas or not. The goals relating to studying abroad are to increase the number of undergraduates taking advantage of the overseas immersion opportunities as well as to provide even more programs abroad. Key to these goals is convincing students and their parents that studying abroad is an invaluable educational opportunity, making it financially less difficult, and making the program timing more flexible.

Foreign language departments

The goal of the foreign language departments at Penn is to stress the importance of foreign language study for everyone in order to communicate with others of different linguistic backgrounds. To do this, the departments stress not just the language, but also the psychological and cultural aspects of the foreign language. Ideally, the departments would like to see all of their students, as well as those in schools outside of SAS, studying overseas. In addition, the Romance Language Department has begun an aggressive campaign to recruit scholars (graduate students) in order to become the best in the country in their respective languages.

Strategies

Proficiency tests

As of April, 1992, three of the four colleges have foreign language requirements. SAS continues its forty-plus year history of a second language requirement for graduation. More recently the Wharton faculty members recommended and approved a rigorous new curriculum which included a foreign language requirement to start in 1992 (Libby, 1990:1). Both Wharton and SAS require three to four semesters of a language. The goal is to have students in both schools attain a designated proficiency at the intermediate mid-level on ACTFL examinations.

The ACTFL-based testing involves evaluating students' proficiency levels before assigning them course credit. This was initiated approximately ten years ago when a study at Penn revealed that fourth semester language students were passing their foreign language requirements with a proficiency level significantly lower than that of the incoming freshmen who were exempt from foreign language study.

(Students are exempt if they achieve a score of 650 or above on language achievement tests.)

With the realization that "seat-time" did not correlate with foreign language proficiency, various members of the Penn community sought to develop tests to ensure adequate language skills. Dr. Roger Allen, former dean of the College of General Studies and presently a professor of Arabic, was instrumental in organizing a method of evaluating language skills. The strategy is to use open-ended, interpretative, oral, and written tests (with authentic tasks) which would be nationally recognized.

The test is taken at the end of the fourth semester or, in some cases, the third semester. The generic ACTFL-based guidelines can be used for any language, while there are language-specific guidelines currently established for French, German, English as a Second Language, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, Portuguese, Russian, and, most recently, Korean. It is composed of five sections: achievement, reading comprehension, composition, listening comprehension, and an oral interview. Although the test is graded pass/fail and will not negatively affect the final grade, it is necessary to pass the test to obtain a grade for the fourth semester course. Students are thought to be motivated in their language studies by the prospective proficiency test.

Members of the faculty are responsible for testing the students. The reading and writing sections take two hours. The listening comprehension is a half-hour taped test. The 15 minute interactive interview is done with one interviewer, preferably not the student's present instructor.

Presently students of the School of Nursing do not participate in the proficiency tests. The School has required competency in a foreign language since 1989; two semesters of study fulfill this requirement. Although the School of Engineering and Applied Science does not have a foreign language requirement, the Computer and Information Science Department does aim for foreign language competency by graduation. These students do not participate in the proficiency tests either.

PLC: Less-commonly taught languages
and content-based instruction

The PLC has ambitiously outlined several strategies for achieving its goal of enriching the University's resources in basic language instruction. Primarily, it has hired graduate students as teaching assistants who are native-speakers of the languages unavailable in the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS). This has limited the cost of hiring full-time faculty, as in SAS.

PLC also has an unusual autonomy, reporting only to the Associate Dean of Humanities in the College of General Studies. Its relative independence allows courses to be offered to students outside the University. In this way, the PLC actually makes money to help cover the expense of a course.

To maintain cost-effectiveness, the PLC focuses on the beginning levels of less commonly taught languages. Its strategy of limiting the depth of the curriculum has allowed for greater breadth.

The number of students who participate in Penn Language Center courses reveals the need for such centers in higher education. In fact, such large class numbers suggest more instructors are already desperately needed in certain languages. The fact that 40% of the enrolled students are from outside the School of Arts and Sciences (Lenker, 1991) proves that students are beginning to be aware of language opportunities and taking advantage of them.

QIP: Study abroad programs

Recent strategies include the organization of a task force to identify how to increase availability of programs offered by the Office of International Programs. This group, which is chaired by the Provost, has representatives from SAS, Nursing, Wharton, and Engineering.

Students from all the undergraduate schools are encouraged to spend a summer, a semester, or a year on one of the Penn-sponsored study abroad programs or on any one of a number of other college-sponsored programs. The overseas programs attempt to focus more on functional language use and less on literature. This is made easier by the 24-hour presence of the target language in the setting. Internships are recommended to get students to use the language outside of the classroom.

Campus wide

Resources exist at Penn to promote language use on campus. Penn as a whole focuses on strategies to make languages a part of a student's life outside the classroom. For example, 32 buildings are connected to a global satellite which allows for television broadcasts in French, Spanish, Italian, and Russian. Van Pelt Library offers books and periodicals in foreign languages. Within the next few years, every dorm room will be hooked to foreign language TV stations.

Grants are made available through the International Programs Fund. This is to provide financial support for "initiatives in area and international studies to help the

University of Pennsylvania maintain existing strength and foster innovations in international education" ("International Programs," 1989). Short-term projects are strengthened by awards of $1000-$2500.

The Office of College House Programs offers opportunities for motivated students to live in the Modern Language College House ("Faculty Master," 1989). This is one of six college houses which has a resident Faculty Master, seven graduate fellows, and 85 undergraduates. The community has dining facilities as well as educational and social activities to maintain language skills.

Outcomes

After identifying the goals and the strategies to implement those goals, it is important to look at what the actual outcomes are at the various centers dedicated to foreign languages.

Colleges: Proficiency tests

Penn was the first American university to develop proficiency testing. It has become a national prototype as hoped and is seen as a valuable and practical asset to Penn's undergraduate curriculum.

Currently there are approximately 500 students in the Romance Language Department who take the proficiency test each semester. It roughly breaks down to 260 Spanish, 225 French, and 15-20 Italian tests given. As it is now, no professors take the proficiency exam; however, some of the teaching assistants and instructors have taken it.

Most of the 500 students pass the proficiency tests. An estimate of 30 students each semester do not pass. They are then notified what part(s) they failed and given specific instruction to improve in that area in order to retake it.

It is ironic that this proficiency-based test offers the possibility of exemption specifically from the proficiency sections. If students score equal to or greater than 650 on the achievement section (which is comparable to the ETS achievement examination), there is no need to continue on to the proficiency-based sections of the test. More than half of the students score greater than 650; therefore, the majority of students are still evaluated on an achievement, not a proficiency, test.

Overall, the proficiency tests at Penn reflect the need for a common yardstick to measure foreign language skills at the undergraduate level. As Lowe (1985) points out, the development of proficiency tests, among other things, helps to set realistic

goals for foreign language teaching. By aiming for the intermediate mid-level, Penn hopes for the students to have the "ability to survive for 1-2 days in a foreign country."

Penn Language Center

If the United States is to "prepare realistically for the next century, [it] must diversify [its] language offerings" (Lambert 1989:7). The University was among one of the first in the United States to offer "exotic" languages as exemplified by its Arabic and Hebrew courses offered as early as 1782 (Spooner, 1990). Currently, out of the 100 different foreign language courses offered at the University, the PLC is responsible for almost half including Amharic, Arabic, Bengali, Cantonese, Ewe, Georgian, Greek,Gujarati, Hausa, Irish Gaelic, Khotanese, Korean, Mandarin, Marathi, Panjabi, Pennsylvania German, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Swahili, Tibetan, Turkish, Vietnamese, Wolof, Yiddish, Yoruba, and Zulu.

Language courses at the PLC are available to fill gaps in the regular language departments. For example, Portuguese is offered only at PLC, as are any business-related language classes. These courses can be used for general requirements as well as major requirements, but the course offerings are limited.

In the spring of 1991, the PLC's fourth semester in existence, 373 students were enrolled in its courses, marking a 43% increase from the previous fall semester (Lenker, 1991). Of those students 98 enrolled in business-related courses in Dutch, German, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, and Russian. French and Japanese are presently the most popular, each with an average of 30 students per semester.

The PLC has been able to strengthen itself by reacting rapidly to global political changes. For example, with the advent of *glasnost* and the increased interest in Russian studies, the Center responded by offering languages of Eastern Europe. Beginning September, 1991, courses have been available in Czech, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Rumanian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, and Ukrainian ("PLC Responds," 1990).

Study abroad programs

Although the Office of International Programs has the ambitious goal of recruiting 35% of Penn's students to spend time overseas, approximately 7% use this opportunity. The record number of students was 374 in the 1989-90 academic year. This number dropped significantly to just over 300 in the 1990-91 academic year.

Given the number of impediments students encounter the low number is not surprising.

Penn-sponsored programs exist in 18 locations in England, Scotland, France, China, Japan, Germany, Italy, Nigeria, Spain, and the former Soviet Union. Nine of the recently established or developing programs involve some of the above countries as well as the former Czechoslovakia, Korea, Mexico, and Turkey. Credits are accepted from these programs although grades are not. Neither credits nor grades are transferable from non-Penn sponsored programs, in which more than half of the study-abroad students participate.

While Penn-sponsored programs do accept credits, often the courses on overseas programs are not applicable to the student's major. This seems to be because of an emphasis on literature with some history and civilization courses available, despite OIP's promotion as otherwise. Students of high proficiency can seek other courses offered at foreign universities; however, it appears that few do so, opting to remain in the American-sponsored programs. The lack of non-literary possibilities increases the difficulty for non-language majors contemplating studying abroad. Even among the language majors, an entire year abroad is relatively uncommon. A recent revision of general undergraduate requirements is perceived by the OIP staff to increase the difficulty of students going abroad.

Internships are highly encouraged while abroad, but so far Penn has not helped organize these opportunities. Even to those students who are able to find an internship, credit is not rewarded. The OIP staff links the lack of participation in internships to a lack of student motivation, rather than student familiarity (or lack thereof) with the foreign country.

Of great concern to prospective participants as well as to the University itself is the issue of financial costs of study-abroad programs. As it is now, a year of study-abroad costs more than staying at the Philadelphia campus, discouraging many students from overseas study. Federal financial aid funds can be used on both Penn and non-Penn sponsored programs; however, Penn grants are able to be used solely on its sponsored programs. Since Penn does not have any of its own island centers with Penn staff, 80% of a student's tuition for study programs goes to the host school (i.e., NYU, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, etc.). On non-Penn sponsored programs, the University loses the student's entire tuition for the semester(s) abroad.

Romance Language Department

There are approximately 2000 students enrolled in Romance Languages each semester, 800 each in French and Spanish and 400 in Italian. Among the juniors and seniors, there are 27 French majors, 13 Spanish majors, and 4 Italian majors. For a university committed to internationalization, this is a minuscule number of language majors. Many of these include double-majors. There are numerous language minors although the number is unclear; very little attention is given to these students (in terms of planning). Incoming freshmen who score greater than 650 on the high school achievement tests are exempt from further language study.

There is an increased effort to broaden the scope of romance languages offered at Penn. For example, the French Department is trying to incorporate into the curriculum French traditions in Canada, Belgium, Switzerland, etc. However, the course selection clearly marks an emphasis on traditions from France.

Although studying abroad is considered to be indispensable, especially for foreign language majors, there is presently no required overseas experience. Most majors go abroad for at least a summer, but the previously outlined obstacles limit the number of students who go for a greater length of time.

Case Study Conclusion

Despite the above seemingly committed strategies and achieved outcomes, there is still evidence of a hesitancy towards a fully recognized dedication to foreign language teaching. For example, in 1989, Dr. Aiken (the Provost) proposed requiring students to have foreign language ability before entering the School of Arts and Sciences (Westwater, 1989). Although professors in the Romance Language Department regret the need to do "remedial" skills which should have been learned in high school, there remains a reluctance to follow the Provost's suggestion and take the initiative among American private universities to require a certain level of proficiency for matriculation.

There is limited interaction between the various language centers and other parts of the University. This may be due in part to the present structure of Penn. "[E]ach school is responsible for its own income and expenditure, and is therefore in competition for available funds [since the] number of classes students take in a certain school determines the allocation of money" (Cort, 1992). Thus, whenever students enroll in classes outside the school in which they are matriculating, their own school loses the funds.

The international program at Penn is ambitious in promoting foreign language proficiency and is considered to be one of the best programs of its type in the country. There is, however, the capacity for better integration of foreign languages with other areas of study at the University. In the words of Romance Language Professor and former Dean Stephen Nichols, "there is a lack of overall coordination" (Westwater, 1989).

In order to better understand the strengths and weaknesses in Penn's foreign language programs, it is helpful to evaluate them using the LP definitions and frameworks previously mentioned.

Review and Evaluation

Rubin asks, "Why do we do planning?" (cited in Thompson, 1973:230). She points out that successful planning is accomplished in American businesses and industries, but not well understood in education. Foreign language planning is situated in an acquisition cultivation planning model (Hornberger, 1992), as opposed to one of status or corpus. Rubin astutely points out that "much information is collected while it is not clear how it will be used in a coordinated way" (cited in Thompson, 1973). By placing Penn's goals, strategies and outcomes within a language planning framework, such as Fishman's (1979), we can better assess whether the University is involved in language planning and evaluate whether it is effective language planning.

Decision-making

Decision-making is the initiating process in Fishman's language planning framework. This involves clarifying issues and alternatives via negotiating and compromising (1979:13). For an acquisition cultivation planning type the users of foreign languages are addressed (Hornberger, 1992). At Penn, these are the undergraduate students.

Recently Penn has involved several task forces and working groups in analyzing how to better prepare University students for a new international role. These committees have clarified the international dimensions present at Penn, but there does not seem to be any negotiating, assessing the needs of students, or identifying "what are the different clienteles and how to plan for them" (Lambert as quoted in Thompson, 1973:228). General goals have been established but whether "consequences have been weighed" or "doubts confirmed or disconfirmed" is not evident.

My concern is the lack of overall student participation and of consideration for the financial aspects. These are essential for making the goals a reality. To truly be effective language planning, these components must be addressed.

Codification

Fishman identifies the codification process of language planning as a somewhat idyllic formal statement of the "purposes, procedures, and resources" outlined in the decision-making process (1979:14). Within the acquisition cultivation planning type, this signifies declaring the functional role of foreign languages within the community-in this case, the Penn undergraduates.

Penn has documented several guidelines for the internationalization of the University. Most notable is the final report of the working groups in "Planning for the Twenty-First Century" ("Planning for the 21st," 1989) and the resulting Five-Year Academic Plan from the President and the Provost ("Planning for the '90s," 1991). The international mission statement at Penn is:

> The University of Pennsylvania affirms its international commitment–in its people, its pursuits, and its programs. It seeks three main goals: The preparation of its students and faculty to be members of a more cohesive world; the generation of knowledge on a more global orientation; and provision of its academic resources, to the extent feasible, to nations and to institutions involved in international activities. Recognizing that it both gives and receives resources through its international activities, the University seeks to achieve and to maintain a role of leadership in the international sphere... (University of Pennsylvania, 1992).

These documents do discuss purposes and the proposed strategies, but resources identified are possibilities, not necessarily certainties. Most importantly, the functional role of foreign languages at Penn is not identified. Overall, however, this stage can be considered relatively effective language planning.

Elaboration

This part of the language planning process is where priorities and deadlines are established. The Five Year Academic Plan ("Planning for the '90's," 1991) identified the following actions:

1 establishing a Provost's Council of International Programs,

2 encouraging undergraduate schools to strengthen their foreign language requirements and to use foreign languages as an integral part of standard course work,

3 supporting a Penn Language Center,

4 establishing a satellite communication uplink and downlink to provide students with ready access to foreign language broadcasts,

5 facilitating undergraduates' participation in well-designed and properly monitored programs of study abroad,

6 strengthening existing area studies programs and establishing new initiatives in East Asian and African Studies,

7 strengthening Penn's involvement in an international cooperative network of major research universities,

8 increasing support for the University library system's international holdings (University of Pennsylvania, 1992).

This goals document is not specific: it neglects to say how Penn is going to "encourage," "facilitate," or "strengthen" these programs. The University is very weak in this key element of language planning.

Implementation

Fishman identifies this language planning process with realizing the codified goals–in this case, those of acquisition–by efforts to "influence the use of particular languages for a particular purpose and function" (1979:15). This is more difficult to assess at Penn because of the relatively short time since the codification of the goals. But already, Penn has implemented some of its goals, for example establishing the Provost's Council and the satellite communication. It also has helped support the PLC; however, one must note that the idea for such a center had been around for fifteen years before a needs analysis was even implemented. The PLC is still quite young, but I foresee even greater outcomes in the near future.

One characteristic of the foreign language department which seems to be contradictory to the University's second goal of foreign language requirements is the exemption of incoming freshmen based on achievement test scores. As Lambert points out, there is a tendency at the college level to "excuse the student from the necessity of further work" rather than to build on the student's foreign language skills (1989:6). Instead of complete exemption, the University should excuse the preliminary levels and encourage at least two semesters at upper levels.

The proficiency exams are part of an ambitious endeavor to increase undergraduates' foreign language proficiency and that should be what the students

are indeed evaluated on. In addition, to further enhance the internationalization Penn strives for, I suggest that the proficiency tests would be valuable for professors outside the foreign language department to take advantage of to improve their own language skills.

In tandem with the proficiency evaluation should be more emphasis on study abroad. Part of the "properly monitored programs of study abroad" should be an adequate method to "relate experience gained abroad to the home campus" (Lager, 1973:214). Once students have returned from their overseas study, there are only token efforts to take advantage of their experience and to increase connections with their on-campus study. Students return to courses not adequately challenging and lacking in number or content. Not only are there not enough high level courses available, students do not have the time to add more foreign language courses to their curriculum. Penn should try to focus on capitalizing on students' experiences and offer more content-based courses in order for the students to resume their new cultural awareness and perspective. Lager (1973) points out that addressing this issue could have positive effects on the entire curriculum and I suggest that students who studied abroad could help organize and run classroom workshops.

My greatest concern involving the foreign language departments at Penn is that the focus is heavily biased towards graduate students. Among undergraduates, the foreign language departments focus only on language majors. These are not the students who need to be convinced that languages are important. A study at the University of Illinois-Urbana demonstrated that only 38% of the students at the 200-level were language majors (Rivers, 1973:86). Although college-level is really too late to be focusing on foreign language proficiency, if Penn wants to be truly committed to its goal of internationalization, more attention should be given to students who are not majors by offering courses tailored to the needs of non-majors. This would involve more content-based courses, for example in science, history, art, etc.

I would like to suggest an added dimension to Penn's implementation process. As Arendt says, the "foreign language profession must work on public relations on the local, state, and national level" (1973:199). Penn should start at the local level. By personal observation, there is a lack of publicity about the various programs, activities, and opportunities offered by the various centers and departments. This is evident in the lack of "noteworthy" news printed in the numerous Penn publications. Penn cannot expect to successfully implement its goals if its community does not perceive the need for such objectives. Nevertheless, in spite of some loopholes, so far Penn has admirably implemented several of its goals.

Evaluation

The purpose of this language planning stage is to provide an "opportunity to determine if the goals...purposes...and intents...are being attained" (Fishman, 1979:17). As far as I can ascertain, there is no means of evaluation for the various strategies outlined by the University. For example, how many languages would be ideal to offer? For how many students? What constitutes a "well-designed study-abroad program"? In what way exactly does Penn want to be more involved in cooperative networks? What kind of support is Penn willing to give the library?

These are the kind of questions for which Penn needs to have specific answers; broad, open-ended goals which cannot be evaluated are not sufficient. It is too early to decide whether the Penn community intends to evaluate its internationalization in a structured fashion; however, there is no evidence to date of a precise outline with which to "grade" its accomplishments. This is a serious shortcoming in the University's internationalization scheme: how will we know if goals are achieved?[1]

Iteration or Cultivation

This is the end and the beginning of the language planning process: the end because it is the final stage, but the beginning of a cyclical process which starts again at the decision-making stage. The planners must remember the conclusions of the evaluation stage and the resulting recommendations. Since there is no evaluation process inherent in the internationalization goal of the University, it is difficult to assert that Penn succeeds at this language planning stage. In all fairness, however, there is a possibility that Penn will cultivate its strategies.

Conclusion

Overall, does the Penn case study demonstrate language planning at Penn? By applying Fishman's language planning framework, it is apparent that the University has addressed a considerable number of goals and strategies. Lowe declares that the goals of the foreign language profession are often so extended that it "should recognize the courage in undertaking so much" (1985:10). Penn can be commended for its ambitious goal of internationalization.

But what exactly does Penn mean by internationalization and how will we know if internationalization has been achieved? Is this goal apparent in all the international programs? Presently, there is a lack of coordination: the lack of widespread cooperation, definitions of goals, and evaluation procedures are serious omissions in a language planning process.

I would like to suggest that institutions of higher education have the responsibility to lead the United States into a new multilingual environment. But inefficiency, ambiguity and failure will result without a clear language planning procedure which takes into account decision-making, codification, elaboration, implementation, evaluation, and iteration or cultivation. To quote Rubin (cited in Thompson, 1973:230), "if we are clear on our goals, then we can begin to specify alternative strategies to reach [them] and to begin to efficiently plan foreign language learning" and, I add, not before then will we realize a multilingual America essential to an ever-shrinking global environment.

---

[1] One possible way to evaluate the internationalization scheme would be to follow a score sheet such as Ockerman's Score Sheet for Measuring the Degree of Internationalization of a University or of a University Professor," found in *The Medallion,* 5(1):8-9.

References

Arendt, J. D. (1973). Motivation, course type, and career objectives. In K. R. Jankowsky (Ed.), *Language and International Studies* (24th Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1973) (pp. 198-201). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Blanco, G. M. (1978). The implementation of bilingual/bicultural education programs in the United States. In B. Spolsky & R. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Case studies in bilingual education* (pp. 454-499). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Corson, D. (1990). *Language policy across the curriculum*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cort, R. (1992, April 6). One University? *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* pp. 3-4.

Faculty master search. (1989, January 24). *The Almanac*, p.3.

Fishman, J. (1979). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English World-Wide 1*(1), 11-24.

Fishman, J. (1981). Language policy: Past, present and future. In C. A. Ferguson & S. Brice Heath (Eds.), *Languages in the USA* (pp. 516-526). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, J. (1982). Sociolinguistic foundations of bilingual education. *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingue, 9*(1), 1-35.

Fixman, C. (1989, May). The foreign language needs of US-based corporations. *Occasional Papers of the NFLC*. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.

Haugen, E. (1966). Linguistics and language planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 50-71).

Haugen, E. (1972) Dialect, language, nation. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 97-111).

Hornberger, N. (1992, Spring) Language Planning and Education Graduate Seminar. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

International Programs Fund. (1989, December 12). *The Almanac*, p.7.

Karam, F. X. (1974) Towards a definition of language planning. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 103-124). Mouton.

Lager, R. (1973). Study programs abroad. In K. R. Jankowsky (Ed.), *Language and International Studies* (24th Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1973) (pp. 212-216). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Lambert, R. D. (1989). The national foreign language system. *Occasional Papers of the NFLC*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center.

Lambert, R. D. (1990). Language policy: An international perspective. *Occasional Papers of the NFLC*. Washington, DC: The National Foreign Language Center.

Lenker, M. (1991, Spring). PLC statistics. *Penn Language News*, p.2.

Libby, A. (1990, April 17). Wharton to enact foreign language requirement in '91. *The Daily Pennsylvanian,* pp. 1,7.

Lowe, P., Jr. (1985). The ILR proficiency scale synthesizing research principle: The view from the mountain. In C. J. James (Ed.), *Foreign language proficiency in the classroom and beyond* (pp. 9-54). Chicago: National Textbook Company.

Ockerman's score sheet for measuring the degree of internationalization of a university or of a university professor. (1992, Winter). *The Medallion,* 5(1):8-9

Planning for the '90s: Five-year academic plan for the University of Pennsylvania. (1991, January 22). *The Almanac,* pp. i-viii.

Planning for the 21st century: Final reports of the ten working groups. (1989, December 5). *The Almanac*, pp. i-xvi.

PLC responds to *glasnost*. (1990, July 19). *The Compass*, p. 5.

Rivers, W. (1973). The Non-major: Tailoring the course to fit the person–not the image. In K. R. Jankowsky (Ed.), *Language and International Studies* (24th Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1973) (pp.85-97). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Rubin, J. (1977). Bilingual education and language planning. In B. Spolsky & Robert L. Cooper (Eds.), *Frontiers of bilingual education* (pp. 282-294). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), 15-34.

Spooner, B. (1990, Spring). History of language study at Penn. *Penn Language News*, pp. 1-2.

Thompson, R. (1973). Language resources and the national interest. In K. R. Jankowsky (Ed.), *Language and International Studies* (24th Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1973) (pp. 225-231). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tollefson, J. W. (1981). Centralized and decentralized language planning. *Language problems and language planning, 5*(2), 175-188.

Tucker, G. R. (1986) Implications of Canadian research for promoting a language competent American society. Offprint from J. A. Fishman, A. Tabouret-Keller, M. Clyne, B. Krishnamurti & M. Abdulaziz, (Eds.), *The Fergusonian impact: In honor of Charles A. Ferguson on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (pp. 361-369). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

University of Pennsylvania. (1991, June). *Annual report 1990-1991*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

University of Pennsylvania. (1992). *Factbook about the international programs at the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Westwater, L. (1989, November 14). Report calls for foreign language proficiency before matriculation. *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, p. 1.